Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1956-58

Eighty-five communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll," and 51 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1958, and includes a total of 283 cities and 87 counties.

Communities on the honor roll have complied substantially with the various items of sanitation contained in the milk ordinance suggested by the U.S. Public Health Service. The State milk sanitation authorities concerned report this compliance to the Public Health Service. The rating of 90 percent or more, which is necessary for inclusion on the list, is computed from the weighted average of the percentages of compliance. Separate lists are compiled for communities in which all market milk sold is pasteurized, and for those in which both raw milk and pasteurized milk are sold.

The suggested milk ordinance, on which the milk sanitation ratings are based, is in effect through voluntary adoption in 480 counties and 1,400 municipalities. The ordinance also serves as the basis for the regulations of 34 States and 2 Territories. In 14 States and 2 Territories it is in effect statewide.

The ratings do not represent a complete measure of safety, but they do indicate how closely a community's milk supply conforms to the standards for grade A milk as stated in the suggested ordinance. High-grade pasteurized milk is safer than high-grade raw milk because of the added protection of pasteurization. The second list, therefore, shows the percentage of pasteurized milk sold in a community which also permits the sale of raw milk.

Although semiannual publication of the list is intended to encourage communities operating under the This compilation is from the Division of Sanitary Engineering Services, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. The previous listing was published in Public Health Reports, March 1958, pp. 279–282. The rating method was described in Public Health Reports 53: 1386 (1938). Reprint No. 1970.

suggested ordinance to attain and maintain a high level of enforcement of its provisions, no comparison is intended with communities operating under other milk ordinances. Some communities might be deserving of inclusion, but they cannot be listed because no arrangements have been made for determination of their ratings by the State milk sanitation authority concerned. In other cases, the ratings which were submitted have lapsed because they are more than 2 years old. Still other communities, some of which may have high-grade milk supplies, have indicated no desire for rating or inclusion on this list.

The rules for inclusion of a community on the honor roll are:

- 1. All ratings must be determined by the State milk sanitation authority in accordance with the Public Health Service rating method, which is based upon the grade A pasteurized milk and the grade A raw milk requirements of the Public Health Service milk ordinance. (A departure from the method described consists of computing the pasteurized milk rating by weighting the pasteurization plant rating twice that of the raw milk intended for pasteurization.)
 - 2. No community will be included

on the list unless both its pasteurized milk and its retail raw milk ratings are 90 percent or more. Communities in which only raw milk is sold will be included if the retail raw milk rating is 90 percent or more.

- 3. The rating used will be the latest submitted to the Public Health Service, but no rating will be used which is more than 2 years old. (In order to promote continuous rigid enforcement rather than occasional "cleanup campaigns," it is suggested that, when the rating of a community on the list falls below 90 percent, no resurvey be made for at least 6 months. This will result in the removal of the community from the subsequent semiannual list.)
- 4. No community will be included on the list unless its milk supply is under an established program of official routine inspection and laboratory control provided by itself, the county, a milk control district, or the State. (In the absence of such an official program, there can be no assurance that only milk from sources rating 90 percent or more will be used continuously.)
- 5. The Public Health Service will make occasional check surveys of cities for which ratings of 90 percent or more have been reported by the State. (If the check rating is less than 90 percent, but not less than 85, the city will be removed from the 90-percent list after 6 months unless a resurvey submitted by the State during this probationary period shows a rating of 90 percent or more. If the check rating is less than 85 percent, the city will be removed from the list immediately. If the check rating is 90 percent or more, the city will be retained on the list for 2 years from the date of the check survey unless a subsequent rating during this period warrants its removal.)

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, July 1956—June 1958

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Community	Date of rating	Community 1	Date of rating	Community 1	Date of rating
Arizona		Illinois—Continued		Kentucky	
Graham County	_ 10-16-1956	Highland Park		Barbourville	11-28-1956
Phoenix		Kenilworth		Bardstown and Nelson	
		Lake Bluff		County	5-21-1957
Colorado		Lake Forest		Bell County	4-19-1957
Boulder County	12-14-1956	Northbrook		Benton and Marshall	
Colorado Springs		Wilmette		County	2- 6-1958
Denver		Winnetka		Bowling Green and War-	
Las Animas-Huerfano	_ 0.2. 100.	Oak Park	3- 6-1957	ren County	7-22-1957
Counties	4-22-1958	Peoria		Brandenburg	4-11-1957
Pueblo County				Butler and Falmouth	4- 2-1958
Weld County		Indiana		Cadiz	
Wita county = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	_ 10 _1 100.			Campbellsville	
District of Colu	mbia	Anderson	5 - 22 - 1957	Covington	
Washington	_ 3- 6-1958	Berne, Bluffton, Warren		Cynthiana and Harrison	
Washington	_ 0- 0-1906	area	1-17-1957	County	4- 8-1958
Georgia		Bloomington	1-10-1958	Danville and Boyle	
	44 00 40**	Bremen	1-29-1958	County	41958
Albany		Calumet region	4-24-1957	Elizabethtown	
Athens-Clarke County		East Chicago		Frankfort	10-18-1957
Atlanta		Gary		Georgetown	
Augusta		Hammond		Greenville	
Bainbridge		Columbia City		Harrodsburg	
Baxley		Cooperative Grade A		Hodgenville	2-14-1957
Cairo	_ 5- 7-1958	area	2-13-1958	Hopkinsville and Chris-	
Calhoun-Gordon	0 5 1050	Holland		tian County	9-26-1957
County		Huntingburg		Lawrenceburg and An-	
Cartersville		${f Jasper}$		derson County	6- 5-1958
Columbus	_ 1-18-1957	Tell City		Leitchfield and Grayson	
Dalton-Whitfield	r o1 1077	Elkhart, Goshen, Nap-		County	10-10-1957
County		panee area		Liberty	10-11-1956
Griffin		Evansville		Louisville and Jefferson	
La Grange		Frankfort		County	31958
Moultrie		Indiana Falls City area.	10-16-1957	Mayfield and Graves	
Quitman	5- 8-1957	Jeffersonville		County	8- 2-1957
Savannah-Chatham	0.05 1056	New Albany		Maysville	7-23-1957
County	9-25-1956	Salem		Monticello	7-20-1956
Statesboro-Bulloch	2 97 1057	Scottsburg		Morganfield and Union	
County		Kokomo	2-19-1957	County	1-21-1958
Valdosta		Lafayette and W. La-		Morgantown	
Waycross	_ 0-14-1900	fayette		Murray and Calloway	
Illinois		Lake County		County	2- 5-1958
	0 10 10 H	Logansport	3-27-1958	Newport and Campbell	2 0 1000
Chicago	6-13-1957	Marion County			10_18_1057
East Side Health Dis-		Michigan City	4-23-1958	County	
trict	6- 5-1958	Muncie		Owensboro	
Brooklyn		New Castle		Owenton	3-31-1958
Cahokia		North Manchester	7- 3-1957	Paducah	7-31-1957
East St. Louis		Peru	4-10-1957	Paris and Bourbon	
Fairmont City		Richmond		County	11958
National City		Rochester		Pendleton County	4- 2-1958
Washington City	2 12 1057	South BendUnion City		Shelby County	1-17-1958
Evanston				Smithland and Living-	
North Shore municipal		Vincennes Warsaw		ston County	2- 7-1958
ities	3-20-1957	Winchester		Trigg County	
Glencoe		** IIIOIIEStel	0- 1-1901	Tings County	10- 0-1900

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, July 1956-June 1958-Con.

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED—Continued

Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating
		North Carolina—Continued		Tennessee—Continued	
Amory	4- 8-1958	Chowan County	7- 5-1956	Greeneville	1-28-1958
Booneville	8-28-1957	Craven County	8-30-1957	Huntingdon	10-29-1956
Brookhaven	1-15-1958	Cumberland County	3-28-1958	Jefferson City	8-20-1956
Canton	11-14-1956	Durham County	4-22-1958	Kingsport	1-30-1958
Clarksdale	1- 9-1957	Edgecombe County	5-21-1958	Knoxville-Knox County	9-25-1957
Columbus	9-19-1956	Forsyth County	2 - 22 - 1957	Manchester	10-12-1956
Corinth	7- 9-1957	Guilford County	9-26-1956	Memphis	3-24-1958
Grenada	9-24-1957	Halifax County	9-13-1957	Morristown	8-20-1956
Hernando	1- 7-1957	Haywood County	3-14-1958	Murfreesboro	8-14-1957
Houston	6-26-1957	Jackson County	12-12-1956	Nashville - Davidso	n
Iuka	7-11-1957	Lee County	3 - 7 - 1957	County	10-28-1957
Laurel	7-12-1956	Lenoir County	2- 4-1957	Newbern	11-14-1956
Louisville	11-23-1956	Macon County	12-12-1956	Newport	. 1- 7-1958
Macon	2-26-1958	Mecklenburg County	3- 7-1958	Paris	11-17-1956
McComb	8- 2-1956	Montgomery County	10-22-1956	Rogersville	1-29-1958
Meadville	3- 7-1957	Moore County		Sweetwater	
Meridian	2-27-1958	Nash County	1-17-1957	Tullahoma	. 10- 9-1956
Morton	7-24-1956	Northampton County	9- 6-1956	Winchester	11-20-1956
New Albany	10-10-1957	Onslow County			
Oxford	8-27-1957	Orange County	8-13-1957	Texas	
Pascagoula	6-19-1957	Pamlico County		Big Springs	12-14-1957
Picayune		Pasquotank County		Brady	6-26-1957
Starkville	3-13-1957	Perquimans County		Brownwood	
State College		Person County		Bryan	
Tupelo	4- 9-1957	Pitt County		Burkburnett	1-14-1958
•		Rocky Mount		Cleburne	1-17-1958
Missouri		Rowan County	6-28-1957	College Station	10- 5-1957
Cape Girardeau	7-12-1956	Sampson County	8-27-1956	Corpus Christi	11- 1-1957
Chillicothe		Scotland County	11-22-1957	Dallas	10-19-1956
Kansas City		Stanly County	12-11-1956	Denison	. 10-30-1957
St. Joseph		Swain County	12-12-1956	Edinburg	3-14-1958
St. Louis		Tyrrell County	2-6-1958	El Paso	2-13-1958
Sedalia		Washington County	2 - 6 - 1956	Falfurrias	2-15-1958
Sikeston		Wayne County	1-27-1958	Gladewater	2-19-1957
Springfield		Wilson County	1-27-1958	Gonzales	6-21-1957
- pringue a contract of the co				Harlingen	2-15-1958
Nebraska		Ohio		Kerrville	4-11-1957
	2-19-1958	Lima	101957	Kilgore	2-19-1957
Omaha	2-19-1936			Kingsville	11-14-1957
N7 J		Oklahoma		Lufkin	9-18-1957
Nevada		Bartlesville	9 96 1057	McAllen	3-14-1958
Clark, Lincoln, and Nye	,	Tulsa		Midland	12-14-1957
Counties		1 uisa	6-21-1957	Mineral Wells	6-21-1957
•		Tammana a		New Braunfels	1-31-1957
New Mexico)	Tennessee		Odessa	12-14-1957
A 11	10 96 1056	Bristol	11 - 7 - 1957	Port Arthur	10-23-1957
Albuquerque Portales		Chattanooga	11-20-1956	San Angelo	8- 8-1957
rortales	9-28-1956	Clarksvil'e		San Antonio	4- 1-1957
North Carolina		Cookeville		San Benito	
North Carotti	ıa	Copperhill.		Sherman	
Alamance County		Covington		Texarkana	
Beaufort County		Cowan			
Bertie County	2 - 7-1958	Decherd		Tyler	
a 1 a .		-			
Camden County Chatham County		DyersburgElizabethton		Vernon Wichita Falls	

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, July 1956-June 1958—Con.

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED—Continued

Community Date of rating	Community Date of ration	g Community Date of rating	
Utah	Virginia—Continued	Wisconsin—Continued	
Logan 5-22-1958	Staunton 4- 4-195	8 Elkhorn 10-24-1956	
Ogden 10-30-1957	Suffolk 6- 6-195	7 Fontana 10-24-1956	
Salt Lake City 5- 6-1958	Waynesboro 12- 5-195	7 Fort Atkinson 10-24-1956	
Utah County 11-29-1957		Green Bay 10-11-1957	
***	Washington	110100110	
Virginia		10 O1086C 1 20 1001	
Abingdon 11- 7-1957	Whitman County 11- 8-195	6 Lake Geneva 10-24-1956	
Alexandria 6-28-1957		Madison 11-29-1957	
Blacksburg 8-16-1956	Wisconsin	Manitowoc 4-12-1957	
Bristol 11- 7-1957	Appleton 1-10-195	7 Oshkosh 7-11-1956	
Christiansburg 8-16-1956	Ashland 10-10-195	7 Racine 7-12-1956	
Franklin 6- 7-1957	Beaver Dam 2- 6-195	7 Ripon 2- 6-1957	
Marion 11-29-1956	Beloit 1-23-195		
Portsmouth	Burlington 10-24-195		
Pulaski 8-17-1956		•	
Radford 8-15-1956	Delavan 10-24-195	•	
Richmond 4-18-1958	Eau Claire 2- 7-195	7 Williams Bay 10-24-1956	

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK

Community and percent of milk pasteurized	$egin{aligned} Date & of \ rating \end{aligned}$	Community and percent of milk pasteurized	$egin{aligned} Date & of \ rating \end{aligned}$	Community and percent of milk pasteurized	Date of rating
Georgia		North Carolina		Texas—Continued	
Cedartown, 96.9	4-11-1957 10-26-1956 10-16-1957 3- 1-1957	Buncombe County, 98.7_Cleveland County, 89.9_Gaston County, 97.9Wake County, 99.9		Fort Worth, 99.98 Longview, 99 Marshall, 98 Palestine, 99.2 Paris, 99	2-20-1957 1- 4-1957 10- 2-1957
Winder, 99 Idaho Ada County, 96		McAlester, 84 Oklahoma City, 98		Virginia Charlottesville, 99.6	9-27-1957
Kentucky Lexington and Fayette County, 99 Madisonville, 99 Princeton, 96.5	1-25-1957	Tennessee Harriman, 95 Kingston, 96.5 Texas		Washington Seattle-King County, 99.7	
Missouri Joplin, 91.4		Abilene, 90	8-13-1957 1-28-1957	Kanawha County, 99 Monongalia County, 97.8	11- 20 -1956 8- 9-1957

Note: In these communities the pasteurized market milk shows a 90-percent or more compliance with the grade A pasteurized milk requirements, and the raw market milk shows a 90-percent or more

compliance with the grade A raw milk requirements, of the milk ordinance suggested by the United States Public Health Service.

Notice particularly the percentage pasteurized in the various communi-

ties listed. This percentage is an important factor to consider in estimating the safety of a city's milk supply. All milk should be pasteurized, either commercially or at home, before it is consumed.

publications

Trachoma Manual and Atlas. PHS Publication No. 541; 1958; by Phillips Thygeson; 42 pages; illustrated; 55 cents.

The stages of trachoma, its clinical and laboratory diagnosis, and the criteria for differentiating trachoma from other follicular disease and either acute or chronic bacterial conjunctivitis are explained comprehensively in this medical handbook. Also discussed are the treatment procedures recommended for trachoma control campaigns. A series of photographs, 51 in black and white and 12 in color, show the gross appearance of trachoma and similar diseases in their various developm ntal stages.

Designed primarily for use by physicians and nurses in the Indian health program of the Public Health Service, the manual has potential value in trachomatous areas of other nations.

Dermatophytes—New methods in classification. PHS Publication (unnumbered); 1957; 15 pages.

It is recommended that physiological tests be used in conjunction with morphological studies for the accurate identification and classification of dermatophyte species.

A series of tests based on the nutritional requirements of certain dermatophyte species for vitamins and amino acids is described. These tests are particularly useful for identifying nonsporulating species such as *Trichophyton verrucosum*, *T. schoenleinii*, and *T. concentricum*. They are also useful for identifying morphologically similar species such as *T. mentagrophytes* and *T. tonsurans* or morphologically atypical strains of any of the *Trichophyton* species.

Another physiological test described is based on the manner by which detached filaments of hair are attacked by dermatophyte species. This is particularly useful in

the separation of *T. mentagro- phytes* and *T. rubrum* which attack
hairs in vitro in different ways.

Free copies may be obtained from the Communicable Disease Center, Public Health Service, Atlanta 23, Ga.

The Research Attack Against Cerebral Palsy. PHS Publication No. 552; 1958; 20 pages; 20 cents.

The nature of cerebral palsy and the collaborative field investigation on this disorder being conducted through the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness are described in simple terms.

The booklet reviews some of the research findings of the recent past which may play an important role in the development of better methods of diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy. It also contains an outline of the institute's grant programs as well as a concise view of the organization and growth of the institute as a component in the research mission of the National Institutes of Health.

The Dental Service Corporation—A new approach to dental care. PHS Publication No. 570; 1958; 70 pages.

Major points to consider in the formation, establishment, and operation of a nonprofit dental service corporation are reviewed.

One section of the pamphlet reports the historical development of the Washington State Dental Service Corporation, describes the corporate structure, and reviews its administration of a dental service program for the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union-Union Pacific Maritime Association Welfare Fund.

Another section covers general questions that planners of a dental service corporation must answer. Included are legal problems, tax re-

quirements, contract negotiations, administrative principles, premium determinations, and statistical system planning.

Summary of Health and Vital Statistics. PHS Publication No. 600; 1958; 27 pages; 25 cents.

Frequently requested recent and background statistical data pertaining to the United States are depicted in 24 tables and 12 charts with explanatory paragraphs. They cover the total population and the population by age as well as school enrollments, marriages and divorces, live births and fetal deaths, and illegitimate live births.

Infant and maternal mortality, total deaths and deaths by age, leading causes of death and leading causes of death by age groups, deaths from cancer and other malignant neoplasms, and deaths from accidents (including cause of injury) are tabulated by year, number, and rate.

The booklet also presents statistics on reported cases of and registered deaths caused by communicable diseases, cases of general illness from selected causes, and average remaining lifetime at specified ages for the entire population as well as by color and sex. A study of the beds available in civilian hospitals and skilled nursing homes is included.

This section carries announcements of new publications prepared by the Public Health Service and of selected publications prepared by other Federal agencies.

Unless otherwise indicated, publications for which prices are quoted are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Orders should be accompanied by cash, check, or money order and should fully identify the publication. Public Health Service publications which do not carry price quotations, as well as single sample copies of those for which prices are shown, can be obtained without charge from the Public Inquiries Branch, Office of Information, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.

The Public Health Service does not supply publications other than its own.